

**LAKE COUNTY BOARD of ADJUSTMENT**  
**August 12, 2015**  
**Lake County Courthouse Commissioners Office (Rm 211)**  
**Meeting Minutes**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Sue Lavery, Paul Grinde, Steve Rosso, Don Patterson, Frank Mutch

**STAFF PRESENT:** LaDana Hintz, Robert Costa, Jacob Feistner, Lita Fonda

Sue Lavery called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm.

For the July 8, 2015 minutes, the following corrections were offered. On pg.1 at the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> line in the next-to-last paragraph, Steve changed “raise it up” to “raise the grade to make the building height”. In the sentence prior to that one, Sue L changed “was it was” to “was”. On pg. 4, Steve added “with” in the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph at the end of the next-to-last line. On pg. 8 in the 2<sup>nd</sup> line of the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, he changed “to the work: to “to do the work”. On pg. 9, the first word of the 8<sup>th</sup> line from the top changed from “intent” to “intend”. On the 3<sup>rd</sup> line of the next-to-last paragraph of pg. 11, “addition” changed to “additional”. On pg. 12 in the 4<sup>th</sup> line of the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, “ladders high” changed to “ladders were high”. Sue L changed “walk” to “walkway” in the next-to-last full paragraph on pg.2 at the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> sentence.

**Motion made by Paul Grinde, and seconded by Don Patterson, to approve the July 8, 2015 meeting minutes as corrected. Motion carried, all in favor.**

**FLATHEAD LAKE CHERRY GROWERS CONDITIONAL USE—FINLEY POINT (4:06 pm)**

Robert Costa introduced the cast of representatives. Bruce Johnson and Robert ‘Bob’ Sandman of Flathead Lake Cherry Growers, Gary & Susan Snow of Table Tree, who were partnered to do the work and Dave DeGrandpre and Alex Hogle of Land Solutions were present. Robert C presented the staff report. (See attachments to minutes in the August 2015 meeting file for staff report.)

Sue L asked if Robert knew the current traffic load. He did not. A lot of residential properties used South Finley Point Road. Frank said there was a traffic counter north of South Finley Point Road where it turned. He had assumed the County was managing that. LaDana thought it might be Fish, Wildlife and Parks (FWP). They were thinking of doing a project. Frank asked where the zoning regulations addressed traffic. Robert replied those regulations did not discuss it. It was an impact of the proposal and that’s what they were supposed to examine as part of a conditional use. The Board needed to look at a finding on pg. 16, which talked about vehicular approaches. The current approach seemed pretty good. They had lots of frontage on that road and a lot of access. There was the question if there were concerns for traffic. LaDana pointed also to #6 [in potential findings] on pg. 15, which talked about public facilities and services.

Frank looked at the history and use of that building. When it was a packing plant, it generated a lot of traffic. Zimmerman's storage building, which was just off the highway before you turned, had been a cherry packing plant maybe 20 years ago. Those two facilities generated a lot of traffic. Whether traffic would increase depended on what you compared. There was less traffic now than there had been in the past, based on the labor and also the product being brought in smaller containers. Robert said the cherry growers association could address that when they spoke. It was a seasonal use.

Steve asked about #7 on pg. 10, highlighting the portion about processing and sale of the products grown directly on their lands. He checked if there was an issue with product being brought from outside the Finley Point area or from outside the state. Robert thought that was a question for the Board. The thought process was this was local produce coming in. A question was what else might come in. It was up to the Board as to how they wanted to move forward on that. The Board would be approving them to do processing of fruit and other natural products. It left room open. The intent was that it be something local. Steve said he couldn't find the words used in #7 in the zoning regulations. Robert said an example would be the sale of anything was meant to be local. The one exception for commercial products was market stands, which talked about products being local. Whether that was enforceable was a different matter. The intent was not to bring in peaches from Georgia, for example. The intent was something local.

Steve pointed to the reference to the regulations on pg. 4 that listed industrial uses for fruit processing and natural food products under conditional uses. It didn't say they had to be grown in the region. He couldn't find that. Was there a spot? LaDana mentioned the East Shore zoning specified 'local area'. Maybe this zoning district didn't say that. Items had come before the Board in the last few years where this was an issue. The neighbors didn't want it there unless it was local. Jacob noted the definition for agricultural use also referred to products grown or raised directly on such land.

Sue L invited the applicants and their team to speak. Alex Hogle of Land Solutions described that he was involved with the preparation of the application. He thanked staff for their work. The majority of issues raised were topics they had considered and anticipated. In terms of general concept, the application was being proposed not by an individual but by an association that was comprised of many property owners within the vicinity of the facility, including areas along the East Shore. An important aspect was to look at the efficiency of the cooperative work between these farmers. The intent was tied into making the industry for cherry processing more feasible and beneficial for those involved. Presently an extraordinary amount of waste occurred. Cherry production was one of the greatest resources in this region of Lake County. It was challenging to market it and have it be something that was sustainable. The concept of the proposal was to utilize culled cherries that were being wasted. The [culled cherries] were fine in terms of juice product and other potential fruit products.

Alex said the application indicated the primary source for the juice would be culled cherries. He thought it was in the interest of the facility and operators that if the Board were to grant the conditional use permit that it not be limited only to culled cherries. The

intent was to try to take advantage and make opportunity from this resource. The real point was to produce high quality juice products utilizing locally raised fruit. He might not have emphasized this well enough in the application. This could potentially include quality uncultured fruit that other farmers in the vicinity wanted to contribute to this purpose. The draft condition #1 intimated that if this was approved, it had to be as presented in the staff report. The staff report specifically only indicated culled cherries.

Alex noted the additional issues of traffic, parking, solid waste management and Environmental Health Dept concerns regarding sanitation. Regarding traffic, the application didn't include substantial information because the regulations didn't have a specific standard for traffic. He contacted the Road & Bridge Dept and no concerns on traffic or the road were indicated. That discussion was included in the narrative the Board had received. The only transportation concerns indicated by the Road & Bridge Dept were if there was going to be a change in the established points of ingress and egress. They would want an approach permit done. [The Road Dept person] concurred with Alex that there was excellent site distance along that frontage.

Alex said he measured N Finley Point Rd and S Finley Point Rd. They averaged a solid 20 feet paved asphalt drivable surface. The closest thing to a standard he'd been able to look at was in the Lake County subdivision regulations, although this wasn't a subdivision. The 20-foot width appeared to be in compliance with that standard. His caveat was they didn't have exact traffic counts. He had also noticed the traffic counter on S Finley Point Road and agreed perhaps an entity such as FWP might have installed those. They hadn't been installed by the County.

Looking at the condition of the road, Alex said it appeared to be in rough condition although he didn't observe potholes. If you drove westward beyond the subject property, the surface didn't change; it was just as rough. That indicated it might not be the facility and its historic operations that contributed to the roughness of the road. It was simply the age and original construction of the road. Alex had been onsite twice. A lot of traffic traveled by, whether it was residential or generated by the state park that was located further out on S Finley Point Road. It was challenging to quantify exactly what traffic to attribute to the current facility, particularly considering the seasonal intensity of use during the cherry harvest particularly. In terms of anticipated traffic from the proposed juicery, it appeared to have a peak employee use around harvest season. The operators wanted to conduct juicing operations after the harvest season. They had the capability to store cherries and it took a while to produce the juice. They didn't want to create a conflict with the present operations of the facility. A rough estimate of 6 to 9 months for general operations would allow them to gracefully operate without conflicting with the facility's main operation. At peak operation, they would have potentially up to 20 to 30 employees.

Alex referred to the parking indicated in attachment 3 of the staff report. He thought it would be practical and simple to provide a reasonable plan for parking at the time of the zoning conformance permit that wouldn't create a conflict with the right-of-way of S Finley Point Drive or adjacent driveways, roads or properties. He gave an example of

how it could occur. The area was graveled. No standard in the regulations required parking. He scaled out 40 spots in the NW corner that would measure 10 feet by 20 feet. This still left the majority of the operable area to function for traffic circulation and operations of the packing facility. They didn't have an issue with that condition.

Alex touched on solid waste disposal. He asked Republic Services, the current waste disposal service, about their capability to provide additional service related to the juicing facility waste. The general staff person he spoke with was unable to answer. The waste generated would be a relatively small amount for the amount of fruit anticipated. Susan and Gary were even contemplating future methods to deal with the pits and to minimize the waste further. It appeared an appropriate service would be needed to deal with any generated waste in a way that didn't conflict with policies of the local transfer site. Those didn't seem to welcome fruit waste during cherry season. That implied it would have to be taken directly to the landfill. Republic Service could probably do that but he hadn't been able to confirm that. The condition drafted regarding solid waste seemed reasonable.

Alex noted they'd corresponded with Environmental Health regarding the current status of the two tracts of record of the subject property. They anticipated the proper [inaudible] regarding sanitation, particularly septic drainfield system was required or additions to the existing system, depending on how things were defined would be met with requirements. He asked what was meant in condition # 14 where the zoning conformance permit was required prior to operation of the facility if the [conditional use] was granted. He asked what type of additional conditions might be required. Robert replied this was standard policy. If the Board decided to approve this, there would be a conditional use approval written, with the things that needed to be done. Once those were done, staff issued the zoning conformance permit. Things that weren't covered as part of this approval that were required to be in there to comply with zoning were the things being referenced. He didn't know in this case that there'd be much more to add since there wasn't construction going on, but they reserved the right to add additional stuff that the Board didn't need to [inaudible]. Frank noted condition #14 was worded to say 'other standard conditions' rather than 'additional conditions'.

Alex invited the Board to ask questions of Bruce Johnson (president of Flathead Lake Cherry Growers Association), Robert Sandman (board of directors of Flathead Lake Cherry Growers Association), and Gary and Susan (from Table Tree Juicing Company).

Steve asked about fruit from outside the Flathead region or from growers outside the association. Bob Sandman affirmed [that outside fruit was anticipated]. This was a good thing because the association produced about 1 to 2 million pounds of cherries a year. About 20% was culled. That was 200,000 to 400,000 pounds of culled material. They would use all of the culled material produced by [inaudible] in the Flathead. Their capacity was greater than that, which meant they could bring fruit from outside to process and part of the revenue from that would go back to the growers. That was part of the lease agreement. The growers would not only receive substantial increase in revenue from their culled material from this juicing plant over what they got now, they would also

receive revenue by bringing excess fruit from other places and processing it. It would be a great thing for the economy and for the onsite growers.

Gary said they would be able to continue to employ people a bit longer. He didn't know how many months of the year they would be running. They did other types of fruit juice other than cherry. It was in their best interest to have things run as long as they could. They were paying rent on a building and they would purchase equipment. They'd have to see how it played out. He didn't see it being year-round, and maybe not even 9 months. It would be nice to employ as many people as they could for as long as they could.

Steve summarized that some of the other fruits would be grown here and some would be brought in. Sue Snow thought there was quite an apple industry south of here. Steve mentioned Hamilton and Sue S agreed. Gary commented the shorter distance they had to truck, the better. Gary and Sue gave some background on their history, experiences and some economics of the business. Gary said [the cherry growers] were a small fraternity. He didn't want to see it getting smaller. If they could help keep people in business and employ people, [that was good].

Steve checked about the current building use for packing, marshalling and storage of fruit, how many employees were associated with the peak time and if that part would continue to run at that level. Bruce thought there might be 10 employees there with the staging operations, plus a couple forklift operators, a couple business people, a couple people sampling cherries for fruit fly. He said maybe 10. Steve checked that trucks brought fruit from the orchards and took fruit from the facility to where it would be packed. Bruce said that was Selah, WA. Steve asked how many truck trips occurred in a day. Bruce said they all [delivered] differently. When he brought in, he brought a ton at a time. His neighbors brought in 10 tons. Steve was trying to figure out the traffic, which included existing employee traffic and existing truck traffic. If they added the fruit processing, those would increase. Bob said truck traffic might not increase because the trucks that went out full currently came back empty to be refilled. In this plan they brought the trucks back with the culls on them, so it was the same truck. Steve confirmed with them that the 20 to 30 employees for the juicing operation were in addition to the 10 employees in the processing operation.

Steve mentioned a place where they took the shells and ground them up for cleaning operations. They used the meat out of the pit for perfumes and flavoring and so forth. Bob offered room in the warehouse if he'd like to start a little business. Sue and Gary compared this to a saying the meat industry used in Kansas City: "We use everything but the oink." They wanted to go in that direction. Their process did generate solid waste, which they wanted to minimize. They could turn that waste into a number of different products. For example, cherries were an amazing anti-inflammatory. When it was mentioned that the landfills didn't let the cherries in, he had to smile. You couldn't compost it openly because of the new fruit fly from Japan. They had to be really careful with what they did. The more of it they could deal with in a building and turn into products that could be sold, the better. They'd won a 2010 innovation award for their

process and the environmental aspects. Part of that was getting stuff out of the waste stream, which was their intention. He knew they could get it down to between 1 and 4 pounds per every 100 pounds of raw cherries. A lot of that was pits. Sue described a previous project they worked on where these figures came from. Gary described some of the projects that could be done with the pits. Steve referenced the comment from CS&KT. Would it be reasonable to temporarily store the waste in such a way to prevent attracting wildlife? Bob agreed it wasn't good to attract bears to residential areas.

Frank asked when this was last a full-blown packing facility, what the employee count was then and what the traffic count might have been. His impression was it was more than what this would generate plus their operation had an overlap. Packing and shipping would have a peak time. It seemed like the juicing would go past the time when the cherries were shipped out. You weren't talking that total amount of employment during the whole time. There would be a little overlap but not a lot. Bob was positive this would be fewer employees than back then when they sorted by hand. Sue S mentioned a packing house that employed over 200 people. Bruce explained that was one of the main reasons the co-op decided to get out of packing. They didn't want to be employers of that many people. They wanted to be orchardists. The folks in Washington had the modern equipment to do all that for them.

Dave DeGrandpre noted that Montana was an agricultural state. In the Flathead, cherries were grown. In terms of economic development and planning throughout the state, the term 'value-added agriculture' was used and every economic development plan across the state sought to provide this. It meant actually making products here, to use the labor force here as well as the natural resources. That was exactly what this [proposal] was. This wasn't necessarily a criteria the Board looked at for a conditional use permit. He thought this was firmly what local economic development organizations sought to do: to take natural resources that they had and add value to them to gain additional revenue here. His second point was that there must be hundreds of lots accessed from S Finley Point Road. He guessed there might be roughly a hundred vehicle trips per day [from this facility] in peak season. It seems like a very minimal addition and a very small increase percentage-wise, looking at the number of lots that were accessed off of it.

Sue L thought there was an advantage of them operating 6 to 9 months per year. One huge reason was they would employ more local people on a longer basis than the shorter small growth season with more transient workers. Sue S and Gary added that usually staff was local. It wasn't all minimum wage. They wanted to pay a living wage.

LaDana spoke with Bill Barron before the meeting, who talked about road widths. It sounded like Lake County had a road width standard of 24 feet. It didn't match the subdivision regulations, which had the standard used for private roads. She recently had discussion with the Commissioners and FWP. There was talk of redoing Finley Point State Park. That might be why the traffic counters were there. Part of the discussions involved an upgrade to Finley Point Road. FWP was trying to come up with funds to help the County do that. Traffic on Finley Point Road was an issue; they knew the roads needed to be upgraded. If FWP was willing to help upgrade the roads, she thought [the

Board] needed to consider that in their decision. [FWP] knew they had a significant amount of traffic on the roads and were willing to step up and help with the situation. This was a big issue for the Commissioners. She didn't know if they could do the whole stretch of road to the park. At this point, it sounded like only a portion of the road could be done, where there were the biggest safety concerns. There were talks for road improvements. Increased truck traffic would obviously be an impact to the road.

As far as agricultural use, LaDana mentioned that one of the biggest complaints from some of the agricultural growers was that produce at fruit stands came from out of the area. If the zoning said it had to be local produce, the callers wanted to know why that wasn't addressed. She suggested [the Board] say whether or not outside produce was allowed in tonight's decision. That way, it would be in the approval for people to see. Robert added it was up to the Board's discretion as to what to consider as local. In previous discussions, people wanted to take in outside fruit and the discussions occurred between the staff and the board about what constituted local. It was up to the Board's discretion as to what local would be. It was another thing to consider.

Frank said the reality on local was economics were a big factor. You could only afford to transport fruit so far before you lost money and quality. If the plant was operating with a positive impact, he would be liberal on what 'local' meant. He didn't see what the problem was. LaDana answered that the issue was someone's peaches weren't selling and the guy next door had peaches brought in from Washington. Someone said that was a different issue at a fruit stand. LaDana recalled the person who wanted to have a winery. They needed to plant vines before they could have a local crop and wanted to bring in fruit from Washington. That was a huge issue for the neighbors, who didn't want that. Dave read from V.E.1.g on page 4 of the staff report, which mentioned industrial uses as conditional use. It didn't site locally grown foods. Finley Point Zoning District was different from East Shore Zoning District, which sited a preference for locally grown food. LaDana said there was still the agricultural use definition in there too. It was the sticking point, where the term 'local' was thrown in. Dave pointed out that V.E.1.g didn't site 'agriculture' although he understood they were related.

Sue L noted the conditional use under consideration was for an industrial use, not an agricultural use. Robert said that use was tied to allowing certain ag uses to be permitted. It was an extension in a sense. He didn't think the intention of the conditional use was to allow huge industrial operations, but rather to allow certain processing that coexisted but in the same sense not to extend too far to put great impacts on the neighbors. He thought the question for the Board was if they were comfortable leaving it blank or did they want to consider what an appropriate definition of 'local' would be. [Staff] didn't necessarily interpret this to just restrict it to juicing. It was the industrial use for processing a natural food product. They could make peach jerky or whatever.

Steve said the concern of the local growers was their product would be displaced by the outside cherries. Sue S said they were partnering with the Flathead cherry growers. Fruit that came in was to benefit the local growers. Bruce agreed [the local growers] had a piece of that. Sue S pointed to a year like this year where the packing house wasn't going

to take their secondary fruit. It could go to a local market except there wasn't one. There could be thousands of pounds that would otherwise be thrown away that could go into juicing. It would probably vary from year to year.

Frank pointed out the applicants were the Flathead Lake Cherry Growers. He doubted they would do something against their own interests. Getting back to agriculture, he read the definition of agricultural use on pg. 7 as talking about somebody who had land in that zoning area and wanted to do an agricultural business or venture on their own land. [The applicants] weren't raising anything on this land. It was industrial, not agricultural. He didn't see what that had to do with this application.

Steve referred to Robert's comment where he got local residents who understood it differently. If the Board had something [in the approval] that said they'd be using all of the local fruit possible before bringing in outside fruit, the planners could use that if they needed to. Robert asked how they would enforce that. Steve supposed at some point if they weren't using the local fruit available in preference for outside fruit and someone complained, it would go to attorneys. Sue L thought the conditional use could be pulled at that point, which would be the enforceability of it. Robert inquired whether the Board would want the planners to look into it if an Idaho truck was spotted when they were usually from Washington. Board members quickly responded no. Steve commented that Robert would like something in the conditions or findings to would allow somewhere for a planner to point when a cherry grower said that fruit from outside was being processed. Robert asked what was outside.

Sue L said they were allowed to process fruit, period. It said [in the staff report] under the conditions that they were expected to use and utilize local (and they could say Flathead) cherries prior to bringing in outside cherries. LaDana wasn't sure they wanted to get into that. How would [staff] know? She wanted them to be able to bring in outside fruit if that was what their interest was. Steve said this issue of processing and sale of products grown directly on their lands was not in the findings of fact. Nothing in the findings addressed the fruit being only local. If they approved these findings and conditions, they wouldn't be restricted. LaDana thought they should still make it clear since Planning got the calls. If they were fine with fruit brought in from anywhere, they just needed to make that clear. It didn't have to be from right there.

Bruce said in the last 3 years, the co-op had been involved with a program called Good Agricultural Practices (GAP). That was becoming the industry standards, pushed by retailers, although it wasn't there yet. The co-op supported GAP and so did the Snows. To say that all Flathead cherries came to the plant because they were locally grown wasn't true. They didn't have control over all the orchards and they wanted to make sure that they knew what had been put on the cherries before they were put in the bottle. There had to be some safety and cleanliness stuff that they were involved in, that this process was some kind of check. Frank asked if they would take cherries from non-association members who were local. Bruce said there were standards for food, safety and how employees were treated. Gary said they'd been doing this since 2004 and they'd been audited every year. Bruce said they had 70 growers that did this right now.



Steve referred to condition #2. Should the clarification on local and non-local fruit be added there? Robert asked how the Board felt about whether or not they would restrict the location. Sue L commented on the point about having a certain standard. If you had a certain standard and your neighbor didn't, why should [the Board] make them take [non-standard fruit]? She didn't have a problem as long as they protected [local] guys but also kept this as a viable operation. Board members didn't have a problem with outside fruit.

Robert suggested adding a condition that would be #1 to state this approval allowed for industrial use (exactly as the conditional use was stated) and at the end of that, add 'regardless of the location where the produce was sourced'. Frank and Sue L liked that this was simple. Steve didn't think that met the possible intent of the residents of the zoning district that wanted to be sure fruit wasn't brought in that would compete with them. Don said that didn't have anything to do with this. Frank said there was jealousy. He thought the folks that complained were those who probably didn't comply with the GAP and other standards. If someone had a fruit stand and brought in Washington cherries early in the season to open early, and someone down the road got ticked off, what did that have to do with zoning and planning? Everyone wanted some sort of industry that would be the magic bullet for the local economy. That was primary money. Agriculture was one of the biggest businesses in the state currently. That primary money was regenerated about 7 times in the local economy. When that dollar came in, you needed other services etcetera supporting it. They should encourage this kind of economic activity and he thought they were.

Steve returned to Robert's suggested phrasing. It worked for him. Robert thought [the planners] could use this enforceably. Sue L asked if standards such as GAP should be mentioned. Robert thought it was okay without since those were someone else's standards. Sue S thought the neat thing was [the project was] working together with the cherry growers so it would be their fruit and they would be part of the decisions on what came in and what didn't. Bruce said if they treated [the cherry growers] badly, the lease could be cancelled.

Steve touched on condition #7. He suggested inserting 'in such a way as to not attract wildlife' after 'in secured containers'. Sue L thought they could be more specific. Don checked that they had solid waste now. Bruce explained that it was sorted in Washington. The only thing that stayed here was a handful of samples to look for fruit flies. Steve checked that with the new facility, the cherries would go to Washington, get inspected and the culls would come back. Sue S remarked that traceability was huge with global GAP to identify where a cherry was from.

Steve and Sue L continued to work with wording for condition #7, to insert after 'secured containers'. Frank thought they'd be okay without examples. The Board decided to go with adding 'so as not to attract wildlife and other pests'.

Steve asked if Lita had the new condition that Robert had suggested. She caught the addition of, “Regardless of location where the produce is sourced...” but not the rest. Robert said the new condition would state, “This approval allows for industrial uses including fruit processing and natural food products on the above-described properties, regardless of the location where the produce is sourced.” Sue asked about renumbering. Robert said staff would make that adjustment.

**Motion made by Steve Rosso, and seconded by Sue Lavery, to approve the conditional use with findings of facts as stated before and conditions with the two additions. Motion carried, all in favor.**

**STUFFLEBEAM CONDITIONAL USE—EAST SHORE (5:27 pm)**

LaDana noted that Ann Moran of DNRC left a comment that LaDana would read. Ann had to leave since the meeting was running long. Jacob Feistner introduced Lisa Stufflebeam and noted that Ann Moran had stated they had permission to develop this DNRC lease property. He presented the staff report. (See attachments to minutes in the August 2015 meeting file for staff report.)

Given state ownership of the land, Sue L asked about the statement near the bottom of pg. 1 under III.Applicability, where the regulations shall apply to all lands within the District except land owned by the State. LaDana explained that the leased lands fell under the regulations and were not excluded. If Fish, Wildlife and Parks had a park in the East Shore zoning district, that would be excluded. This was specific to the East Shore zoning district. Other zoning districts were not like that.

Steve asked when the 2-year timeframe for a temporary dwelling approved for construction period started. LaDana thought that was as soon as the approval was permitted. Most of the time, construction started at that point. They could ask for another 2 years. What they didn’t want was a blanket approval hanging out there forever. Steve checked that they didn’t want someone to use such an approval and not do their construction. There was a condition regarding that. There were other temporary dwellings that were approved to be used part of the year. This one could be used year-round because it was for construction purposes.

LaDana read Ann Moran’s letter, supporting the Stufflebeams’ application. (See attachments to minutes in the August 2015 meeting file for staff report.) Ann was the DNRC Kalispell unit planner.

Lisa Stufflebeam answered questions. LaDana asked when they planned to start construction. Lisa said they wouldn’t move the RV up there until the septic was in place. LaDana checked that zoning conformance had been submitted since Planning wouldn’t sign off on the septic permit until after the zoning conformance permit was in, and Jacob confirmed.

*Public comment:* No public present.

**Motion made by Paul Grinde, and seconded by Don Patterson, to approve the conditional use with staff recommendations and findings of fact. Motion carried, all in favor.**

**OTHER BUSINESS (5:37 pm)**

None.

**Sue Lavery, chair, adjourned the meeting at 5:37 pm.**